



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,562	08/30/2001	Ronald P. Doyle	RSW920010161US1	2522
7590	12/29/2005			EXAMINER
Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts IBM Corporation T81/503 PO Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			DIVECHA, KAMAL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/943,562	DOYLE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 45-80, 82-99 and 101 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 45-80, 82-99, 101 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**Response to Arguments**

Claims 45-80, 82-99 and 101 are pending in this application.

Applicant's arguments filed August 22, 2005 have been fully considered, based on the applicant request in the request filed for continued examination (RCE) on September 26, 2005, but they are not persuasive.

The examiner summarizes the applicant's arguments presented in the response filed on August 22, 2005 and addresses each argument individually.

As per applicant's arguments filed on August 22, 2005, the applicant argues in substance that:

1. "Hu specifically discusses that a direct connection between the content server and the client would result in significant more efficient communication and therefore Hu teaches away from a redirect link that is configured to redirect the request to the control unit of the intelligent storage system rather than a direct connection to the storage device" and "the redirect mode proposed by Hu returns to the requesting client whatever information is required to enable client to establish a direct connection with the content server and therefore the redirect mode of Hu is not equivalent to the redirect link as recited in the current claims, and it would not be obvious to modify the redirect mode proposed by Hu to include the storage controller of Blumenau" (remarks, pg. 14, 15, 16).

In response to [1.]: Examiner agrees that Hu discusses that a direct connection between the content server and the client would result in significantly more efficient communication (Hu, col. 12 L19-34), however Examiner does not agree that Hu teaches away from a redirect link that is configured to redirect the request to the control unit of the intelligent storage system.

Hu does teach that a direct connection between the content server and the client would result in more efficient communication **based on the redirection criteria such as a location of the client, proxy and the content server**. For example: client and the content server may be physically located within a few miles of each other on the east coast while proxy might be located on the west coast. It would make a complete sense in terms of the transmission time efficiency for the manager (proxy) to enable client to directly connect to the content server by redirecting the client to the content server.

The network request manager of Hu (fig. 1 item #102) receives the request first and evaluated the redirection criteria to determine if a direct connection between the content server and the client would result in an efficient communication by redirecting the client by enabling the client to connect to content server directly (note redirection is achieved by enabling the client to directly connect to the content server).

Hu further provides another example of redirection criteria (Hu, col. 12 L25-52) being redirecting all of certain types of the client requests.

Therefore Hu does not teach away from a redirect link that is configured to redirect the request to the control unit but teaches that the redirect module would result in more efficient communication based on the redirection criteria.

In any event, even if Hu teaches away from a redirect link that is configured to redirect the request to the control unit of the intelligent storage system, Hu's system explicitly reads onto the claimed subject matter of the instant application. On the other hand, the claim language does not state that direct connection between the content server and the client should not result in

significantly more efficient communication. Therefore teaching away does not necessarily mean that the system is not capable of performing the claimed invention of the present application.

Applicant admitted that the redirect mode proposed by Hu returns to the requesting client whatever information is required to enable the client to establish a direct connection with the content server (remarks, pg. 14), but argues that the redirect mode of Hu is not equivalent to the redirect link as recited in current claims.

According to the applicant, a redirect link enables returning a redirect status code to a requester of the object that would redirect the requester to the control unit of the intelligent storage system (i.e. would establish a direct connection with the control unit of the Intelligent storage, remarks, pg. 16).

Hu's system explicitly employs the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP, col. 5 L30-40), which is well known to those skilled in the art for communication. The redirect mode proposed by Hu returns "whatever information" is required to enable the client to establish a direct connection with the content server.

The process of returning "whatever information" to the client disclosed by Hu should be interpreted as the process of returning a status code and a destination address that would redirect the client to the final destination by enabling a client to directly communicate with the destination, simply because redirection, status code, redirect status code, redirect link etc., are all well known features of the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP, see Fielding et al., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol – HTTP/1.1; Request for Comments: 2616 and 2068 June 1999), which is explicitly disclosed by Hu.

2. “Hu does not teach or suggest a redirect link that enables returning a redirect status code to a requester of the object (remarks pg. 16)”.

In response to [2.]: Hu’s system uses the Hyper text Transfer Protocol (see above) and Hu teaches a redirect module that returns the client “whatever information” is necessary for the client to directly connect to the content server. Redirect link, redirect status code and redirecting are well-known features of HTTP protocol. The process of returning a redirect status code in redirecting a client is an inherent feature of http protocol. Therefore, returning “whatever information” by the redirect module of Hu’s system should be interpreted as including redirect status code because http is well known to those skilled in the art for communication as evident by Hu (col. 5 L20-40).

3. Applicant seems to read the specification into the claims (remarks, pg. 17). Examiner would like to remind the applicant the following:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., status code can include information about the redirect link....) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

4. “Hu nor Blumenau discloses that the contents of redirect link are manually created” and further argues that the action does not satisfy the requirements for an obviousness rejection under 103, **which requires there be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references**

**themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled** in the art to support this modification of Hu and Blumenau (remarks, pg. 17).

Applicant admits that Hu proposes dynamically creating a redirect link and teaches away from manually creating the contents of a redirect link. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to manually create a redirect link because a change in an approach of manually creating a redirect link is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is explicitly stated in the rejection, which is: "it would have enabled an administrator to redirect the traffic to an appropriate destination".

5. "Hu does not teach or suggest requesting the establishment of a subsequent connection automatically in response to receiving the redirect status code for retrieving the particular object directly from the intelligent storage system".

In response to [5.]: The claimed subject matter is a well-known feature of Hyper Text Transfer Protocol as admitted by the applicant (Specification, pg. 10, 15-17). The redirect code of the HTTP protocol automatically causes the sender to establish the subsequent connection.

6. None of the references provides any motivation to modify Hu or Blumenau (remarks, pg. 18) because the cited portions of Yoshida merely provides general advantages of a network-attached storage.

In response to [6.]: Yoshida clearly indicates why one of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to employ network-attached storage system by disclosing the advantages of a network-attached storage. Therefore based on those advantages, one of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to modify Hu in view of Blumenau and further in view of Yoshida to employ a network-attached storage system. The cited advantages are the motivation of using the network-attached storage system.

In conclusion, the modification of cited references in the rejection below would have significantly resulted the claimed invention disclosed in the present application.

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

##### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 45-49, 51, 53-56, 60-61, 63-80, 82-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (hereinafter Hu, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,322 B1) in view of Blumenau et al. (hereinafter Blumenau, U. S. Patent No. 6,421,711 B1).

As per claim 45, Hu discloses a method of serving objects in a computing network, the method comprising: receiving a request for an object stored on an intelligent storage system, the request being received by a web server (fig. 4 block #404 and fig. 2 block #202); evaluating the request based on criteria (fig. 4 item #406 and col. 7 L53-63); if the criteria are met, redirecting the request to the content server (every server has a control unit, col. 5 L45-47, col. 12 L35-49); and if criteria are not met, serving the stored object via the web server (col. 11 L48-59), however, Hu does not explicitly disclose a system wherein the intelligent storage system comprises a plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for the request to one of the plurality of storage devices.

Blumenau, from the same field of endeavor, discloses an intelligent storage system comprising a plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for the request to the one of the plurality of storage devices (fig. 1 item #28-31, item #27, fig. 21 item #246, fig. 22 item #269, col. 2 L 48-55, col. 7 L21-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hu by incorporating the teaching of Blumenau as stated above (i.e. implementing storage system of Blumenau with Hu's system or replacing a group of content server in Hu's with the storage system of Blumenau) in order to implement in the system the intelligent storage system

comprising plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for the request to the one or more of the plurality of storage devices.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because: first it would have reduced the increasing cost of management by reducing number of storage objects to be managed, secondly the storage controller would have controlled access to the data storage (Blumenau, col. 1 L18 to col. 2 L45), and third it would have provided an efficient storage system with increased storage capacity.

As per claim 46, Hu discloses the process of informing a sender of the received request that a subsequent connection to the control unit should be established for serving the stored object when the selected criteria are met (col. 6 L14-22; col. 13 L45-47; col. 12 L43-48; col. 18 L47-51).

As per claim 47, Hu discloses the process wherein the subsequent connection bypasses the web server (col. 12 L35-52).

As per claim 48, Hu discloses the process wherein informing a sender of the received request that a subsequent connection to the control unit should be established for serving the stored object when the selected criteria are met uses a redirect code (interpreted as the address of the intelligent storage system) of an existing protocol (col. 11 L17-34 and col. 3 L8-10).

As per claim 49, Hu discloses the process wherein the existing protocol is Hypertext Transfer Protocol (col. 5 L29-34; col. 6 L60-61).

As per claim 51, Hu discloses the process of requesting establishment of the subsequent connection automatically in response to the redirect code (col. 12 L35-40).

As per claim 53, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises comparing a size of the stored object to a statically-specified number (col. 10 L1-9; col. 8 L26-38 and fig. 6 step#602).

As per claim 54, Hu discloses the process wherein the statically-specified number is specified by an administrator using a configuration interface (col. 7 L60-62).

As per claim 55, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises comparing a size of the stored object to a dynamically-determined number (fig. 6 block #204 and step #602, 604; col. 7 L53-61; col. 5 L55-67 and col. 10 L1-5).

As per claim 56, Hu discloses the process wherein the dynamically-determined number is determined in view of current network conditions (col. 9 L7-65).

As per claim 60, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises determining whether a naming extension matches an element in a set of dynamically-determined set of naming extensions (fig. 7 block #702 and fig. 6 step #602 and col. 8 L26-38).

As per claim 61, Hu discloses the process wherein the dynamically-determined set of naming extensions is determined in view of current network conditions (col. 9 L7-65).

As per claim 63, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises determining whether an object name matches an element in a statically-specified set of object names (fig. 7 block #702 and fig. 6 step #602 and col. 8 L26-38).

As per claim 64, Hu discloses the process wherein the statically-specified set of object names is specified by an administrator using a configuration interface (col. 7 L60-64).

As per claim 65, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises determining whether an object name matches an element in a set of dynamically-determined set of object names (fig. 7 block #702 and fig. 6 step #602 and col. 8 L26-38).

As per claim 66, Hu discloses the process wherein the dynamically-determined set of object names is determined in view of current network conditions (col. 9 L7-65).

As per claim 67, Hu discloses the process wherein the predetermined criteria comprises a content type of the stored object (col. 13 L5-10).

As per claim 68, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises determining whether a content type matches an element in a statically-specified set of content types (fig. 7 block #702 and fig. 6 step #602 and col. 8 L26-38).

As per claim 69, Hu discloses the process wherein the statically-specified set of content types is specified by an administrator using a configuration interface (col. 7 L53-62; col. 8 L42-59).

As per claim 70, Hu discloses the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises determining whether a content type matches an element in a set of dynamically-determined set of content types (fig. 7 block #702 and fig. 6 step #602 and col. 8 L26-38).

As per claim 71, Hu discloses the process wherein the dynamically-determined set of content types is determined in view of current network conditions (col. 9 L7-65).

As per claim 72, Hu discloses the process wherein the predetermined criteria comprises using one or more wildcards which may operate to match more than one stored object (col. 6 L53-61).

As per claim 73, Hu does not explicitly disclose the system wherein the intelligent storage system comprises network-attached storage. Blumenau explicitly discloses the system comprising a network-attached storage system (fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Blumenau as stated above with Hu, in order to employ the network-attached storage system. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 45.

As per claim 74, Hu discloses a method of creating a link to an object, the method comprising: receiving a request for a particular object (col. 5 L29-34; col. 18 L29); evaluating characteristics of the particular object (col. 6 L62-67 and col. 8 L8-10; col. 18 L30-31); creating a redirect link on one or more web servers from which the particular object may be requested if the evaluated characteristics of the particular object meet criteria (col. 5 L41-47 and col. 12 L43-52), the redirect link being configured to redirect the request to the content server (fig. 2 item #212, col. 12 L35-36) and creating an object serving link on the one or more web servers if the evaluated characteristics of the particular object do not meet the criteria (col. 6 L43-61 and col. 11 L45-59), however Hu does not disclose the process of receiving a request for a particular object in an intelligent storage system comprising a plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine mapping for the request to one of the plurality of storage devices. Blumenau, from the same field of endeavor, discloses the process of receiving a work request

(receiving a request for a particular object) in an intelligent storage system comprising a plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for the request to the one of the plurality of storage devices (fig. 33 item #382, fig. 1 item #28-31, item #27, fig. 21 item #246, fig. 22 item #269, col. 2 L 48-55, col. 7 L21-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hu by incorporating the teaching of Blumenau as stated above (i.e. implementing storage system of Blumenau with Hu's system or replacing a group of content server in Hu's with the storage system of Blumenau) in order to implement in the system the intelligent storage system comprising plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for the request to the one or more of the plurality of storage devices. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 45.

As per claim 75, Hu discloses the process wherein the redirect link enables returning a redirect status code to a requester of the object (col. 12 L43-52).

As per claim 76, Hu discloses the process of requesting establishment of a subsequent connection automatically in response to receiving the redirect status code for retrieving the particular object directly from the intelligent storage system (col. 12 L35-40 and col. 18 L47-51).

As per claim 77, Hu discloses the process wherein contents of the redirect link are programmatically created (col. 5 L20-22 and L40-47).

As per claim 78, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the contents of the redirect link are manually created, but it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hu in view of Blumenau in order to create the contents of the redirect link manually. One of ordinary skilled in

the art would have motivated because it would have enabled a web site developer or an administrator to redirect traffic to an appropriate destination.

As per claim 80, Hu discloses a method of serving large objects, the method comprising: receiving a request for a particular object stored on an intelligent storage system (col. 5 L29-34; col. 18 L29); creating a redirect Link on one or more web servers from which the particular object may be requested (col. 5 L41-47 and col. 12 L43-52); and serving the particular object from one of the plurality of storage devices via the control unit of the intelligent storage system using the redirect Link **or** through a selected one of the servers using the object serving Link (col. 5 L55-67 and col. 16 L65-67 to col. 17 L1-5; col. 6 L17-22), however Hu does not discloses an intelligent storage system comprising a plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine mapping for the request to one of the plurality of storage devices. Blumenau, from the same field of endeavor, discloses the process of receiving a work request (receiving a request for a particular object) in an intelligent storage system comprising a plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for the request to the one of the plurality of storage devices (fig. 33 item #382, fig. 1 item #28-31, item #27, fig. 21 item #246, fig. 22 item #269, col. 2 L 48-55, col. 7 L21-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hu by incorporating the teaching of Blumenau as stated above (i.e. implementing storage system of Blumenau with Hu's system or replacing a group of content server in Hu's with the storage system of Blumenau) in order to implement in the system the intelligent storage system comprising plurality of storage devices and a control unit configured to determine a mapping for

the request to the one or more of the plurality of storage devices. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 45.

As per claims 79, 82-99, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 45-49, 51, 53-56, 60-61, 63-78 and 80. Therefore, claims 79, 82-99 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 45-49, 51, 53-56, 60-61, 63-78 and 80.

2. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (hereinafter Hu, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,322 B1) in view of Blumenau et al. (hereinafter Blumenau, U. S. Patent No. 6,421,711 B1) and further in view of Dillon et al (hereinafter Dillon, U.S. Patent No. 6,658,463 B1).

As per claim 50, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process of using the wireless session protocol. Dillon explicitly discloses a satellite communications network including an upstream proxy server and two reporting downstream proxy servers wherein communication takes place through a wireless satellite link using wireless session protocol (fig. 7 and col. 12 L52-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Dillon with Hu in view of Blumenau in order to enable communications wirelessly by using wireless session protocol. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have improved the transmission efficiency by providing high-speed and continuous channel carrying packetized data (Dillon et al, col. 1 L15-21; col. 3 L38-57).

3. Claims 52 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (hereinafter Hu, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,322 B1) in view of Blumenau et al. (hereinafter Blumenau, U. S. Patent No. 6,421,711 B1) and further in view of “Official Notice”.

As per claim 52, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the predetermined criteria comprise a size of the stored object. But, it is well known and obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to process the request based on the rule that addresses the size of the stored object. Therefore, Official Notice is taken to indicate that the criteria includes the size of the stored object is obvious and well known in the art. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled efficient filtering capabilities, which would have resulted in a robust decision making process.

As per claim 62, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the predetermined criterion comprises a name of the stored object. But, it is well known and would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to process the request based on the rule that addresses the name of the object. Therefore, Official Notice is taken to indicate that the criteria including the name of the stored object is obvious and well known in the art.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 52.

4. Claims 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (hereinafter Hu, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,322 B1) in view of Blumenau et al. (hereinafter Blumenau, U. S. Patent No. 6,421,711 B1) and further in view Abraham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,270).

As per claim 57, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the criteria comprises a naming extension of the stored object. Abraham explicitly discloses the filtering rule comprising naming extension of the stored object (col. 45 L1-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Abraham as stated above with Hu in view of Blumenau in order to provide a rule or policy based on the naming extension of the object. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the requests or packets are filtered according to most recent mapping information, which would have resulted in an robust and efficient decision, and further would have controlled the network congestion and decreased network latency.

As per claim 58, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process wherein evaluating the request based on criteria comprises determining whether a naming extension matches an element in a statically-specified set of naming extensions. Abraham explicitly discloses the process of determining whether a naming extension matches an element in a statically specified set of naming extensions (col. 45 L1-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Abraham as stated above with Hu in view of Blumenau in order to determine whether a naming extension matches with the statically specified set of naming

extension. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reason as set forth in claim 57.

As per claim 59, Hu in view of Blumenau does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the statically-specified set of naming extensions is specified by an administrator using a configuration interface. Abraham discloses a graphical user interface where system administrator is provided with the configuration interface for specifying file type policy by identifying file extensions (col. 11 L26-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Abraham in order to provide a configuration interface for specifying the rules and policies based on naming extensions. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have allowed an administrator to establish policies through the graphical user interface.

5. Claim 101 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu (hereinafter Hu, U.S. Patent No. 6,173,322 B1) in view of Blumenau et al. (hereinafter Blumenau, U. S. Patent No. 6,421,711 B1) in view of “Official Notice”, and further in view of Abraham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,270).

As per claim 101, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 45-49, 51-80 and 82-99. Therefore claim 101 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 45-49, 51-80 and 82-99.

**Additional References**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Goldman U.S. Patent No. 6,611,866 B1.
- b. Chow et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175.
- c. Hinrichs et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,026,431.
- d. Sim, Pub. No.: US 2003/0031176 A1.

**Conclusion**

An attempt was made by the examiner on December 16, 2005 to contact the applicant representative Ms. Laura Kelly to request for a proposed amendment, however the representative failed to timely respond to the examiners message.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
December 22, 2005.

  
ZARNI MAUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER